

But at last it is out and a copy has been delivered or mailed to every member of the society. If some there be who were annoyed at the delay, will they please bear in mind the possible degree of annoyance to everyone in the State Society office—and forgive!

TO LICENSE CALIFORNIA GRADUATES WITHOUT EXAMINATION.

There is a bill before the present Legislature that looks so good at first glance, to the average citizen, that it seems likely to be well thought of by the legislators and to pass. It is a bill to license all graduates of legally chartered and reputable medical schools in California, to practice without an examination by the Board of Medical Examiners. Of course the osteopathic schools will be graduating "doctors of medicine" and of course they are legally chartered and, equally of course, they will howl mightily that they are most "reputable"—in spite of the minutes of the Board of Examiners!

VENARSEN.

This product, prepared by the H. M. Fletcher Co., Inc., Los Angeles, California, is being extensively exploited as an intravenous injection for the treatment of syphilis, pellagra, tuberculosis, anemia, etc. This product is described in this number of the Journal, in the Department of Pharmacy and Chemistry, p. 159. It is almost criminal for physicians to use a preparation of secret composition and to administer it by intravenous injection, a method which in itself is likely to give rise to accidents.

THE IMPUDENCE OF T. FLOYD BROWN, M. D.

Unfortunately he is really a graduate in medicine and licensed to practice in California. His name is T. Floyd Brown and at one time he was a member of the Los Angeles County Medical Association, but he was dropped from that organization for unethical conduct. He keeps up the same sort of conduct, but like most of his kind, is a plausible talker and writer and may deceive some of our less suspicious members. He is promoting a special "no-detention" secret treatment of his own, for the morphine-opium habit, and has sent circular letters to a great many, if not all, physicians in this state. He announces in one of his circulars that he has opened a San Francisco office (headquarters being in Los Angeles) and in letters states that he has secured the services of a physician in San Francisco to look after his business. The physician mentioned called at the JOURNAL office and stated emphatically that he would have none of T. Floyd Brown or his treatment or his methods. Quite a nice mess. Just remember something of the record of T. Floyd Brown, when his letters and circulars come to your office, and cast them into the waste basket.

OUR LAW DEPARTMENT.

Every activity of the Society is growing, and this includes the work of our legal department. The actual defense of alleged malpractice suits is only a part of the work; our attorneys do a great deal of work for the members, in smoothing things over, preventing suits, advising, and the like. We should appreciate this and co-operate with them. Our members should bring to our attorneys their law work outside of suits and threats for damages; such work as the preparation of wills, deeds, contracts, etc. Our attorneys are the best all-around attorneys that we can secure and they can attend to your private work as well as to your interests when you are threatened or sued by some disgruntled patient. That is, if they have the time. We now have first-class attorneys representing us in several centers and before long we will undoubtedly have a legal representative in nearly all of the larger places in the state. Do not think or feel as one physician did, who said to one of our attorneys: "I suppose you specialize on malpractice cases, and you would not attend to drawing my will"! This shows a sad lack of understanding of a lawyer's business, for he would not be a good lawyer to defend you in a malpractice suit if he were not a good lawyer in every way; with a sound knowledge of the law in general and a first-class understanding of procedure and general law practice. In a letter, one of our attorneys, discussing several matters of general interest to the Society, said: "The handling of malpractice cases is a losing proposition from a lawyer's standpoint, as commercial work is not as difficult work and pays him directly and indirectly very much more." It is evident that eventually the Society will be doing a great deal of law work for its members, but the members must come in closer touch with our attorneys and the relations between them must be more friendly and more personal and must not be confined to this one subject of malpractice matters.

MEDICAL DEFENSE DISCUSSION.

Two communications of importance have been received in answer to the request to our members to set forth their views on the subject of medical defense by the Society and the rules pertaining thereto. Dr. Kreutzmann brings out some very broad general principles which may well be carefully thought over and perchance acted upon in the future; there seems no reason why a stupid judge should not be made to know that we are aware of his stupidity or injustice; and such things do happen.

Dr. Juilly brings up a number of detail points and they are open for discussion. Does it work a hardship on any physician to require that he shall not sue to collect an account within one year without first putting his case and account before the Council? Many physicians do not approve of suing for accounts at all. Dr. Juilly is wrong in some of his assumptions. The majority of people who refuse to pay their accounts and threaten counter suits do not belong to the migratory class of hotel dwellers. And as a matter of business